

**REMARKS**

***Claim Objections***

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 11, 14, 16, and 17, because of informalities. Regarding claims 1, 11 and 14, applicant has cancelled these claim, thus rendering the Examiner's rejection moot, with regards to them. Regarding claims 16 and 17, applicant has corrected the spelling of the word "ratchet". In addition, regarding dependent claim 16 applicant has made the appropriate corrections to the claim so as to render it grammatically correct.

***Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-12, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which the applicant regards as the invention. The applicant has cancelled claims 10-12, thus rendering the Examiner's rejection moot, with regards to them. Regarding dependent claim 17 applicant has placed "said sloped ramp side" in proper antecedent form.

***Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3-6 as being anticipated by Ikeda et al. The applicant has cancelled independent claim 1, thus rendering the above rejection moot. Regarding dependent claims 3-6 applicant has amended these claims to depend on new independent claim

10/764,959

18, and as such should be in a condition for allowance, as per the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, and 9-17 as being anticipated by Lyons. The applicant has cancelled claims 7, 10-14, thus rendering the examiner's rejection moot, with regards to them. Regarding dependent claims 9 and 17, applicant has amended these claims to depend on new independent claim 21, and as such should also be in a condition for allowance, as per the reasons set forth below. Regarding dependent claims 15 and 16, applicant has amended these claims to depend on new independent claim 18, and as such should be in a condition for allowance, as per the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner has objected to dependent claims 2 and 8 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Regarding new claim 18, applicant has taken the Examiner's advice and has rewritten old dependent claim 2 in independent form and has included all the limitations of old independent claim 1. Regarding new claim 21, applicant has taken the Examiner's advice and has rewritten old dependent claim 8 in independent form and has included all the limitations of old independent claim 7. Since new independent base claims 18 and 21 should now be in a condition for allowance, all claims that depend on them should also be in a condition for allowance.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, applicant's claims are patentable over the cited prior art and the application should be in condition for allowance.

10/764,959

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas A. O'Rourke  
Reg. No.: 27,665  
BODNER & O'ROURKE, L.L.P.  
425 Broadhollow Road  
Melville, New York 11747  
(631) 249-7500

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the foregoing Response was mailed by first class mail,  
postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 24 day of March 2006.



Thomas A. O'Rourke